APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/923,440	08/08/2001	Hideki Matsunaga	110331	9076

25944   7590   08/19/2008
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 320850
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER
LY, ANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 May 2008</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

       1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is response to Applicant's RESPONSE filed on 05/22/2008.

2.   Claim 20 has been added

3.   Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments filed 05/22/2008 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

Applicant argued that, "access control in Tada is not performed in accordance

with defining a retrieval condition for retrieving an object." (page 8, 2nd paragraph, thru

page 9, in the remarks).

Tada teaches retrieving a document or object under a retrieval condition and the

retrieval result to be displayed is based on the authorized level or access right of the

retriever (see figs. 7-10, col. 1, lines 15, and col. 9, lines 10-18; also see col. 10, lines 6-

12 and lines 50-54). That is, when a document is registered or stored, retrieval data for

document retrieval is created for each registered document. So each user or group want

to retrieve the stored object or stored/registered document, he/she should have

accessible or retrieval condition to that object comparing with the access control table in

which information indicating accessibility of groups of users or users as the

object/document retrievers for the document being registered and the access right

information setting to the users (col. 2, lines 1-38; also, col. 7, lines 5-18, and lines 35-

52 and col. 8, lines 1-12); and allowing the user completely authenticated to access

document management system containing registered documents for which access

authentication has been already established, thereby conducting the access control

operation; and to accomplish the access control operation for each document object

through the user authentication, and access control operation in a plurality of levels

corresponding to groups to which users belong. When users having different authorized

access levels are allowed to access a document, the document is required to be

registered to a plurality of databases, also, access right is depending to each user to

each document object: the access right information to each user associated to the

document and retrieval condition (col. 1, lines 45-67 and col. 2, lines 1-8 and col. 7,

lines 7, lines 10-18 and col. 8, lines 18-35). While Nakagawa teaches a document

having attributes such as a date when a document was made (col. 5, lines 1-45 and col.

8, col. lines 42-67); and performing the access control based on the access right and

displaying the result (col. 9, lines 18-45 and col. 10, lines 10-55).

Applicant argued that, "Susaki does not teach access control means performing

access control." (page 10, paragraphs 1-3, in the remarks).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain

features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

(i.e., authorized user, allowed access type, access authorized and access unauthorized)

are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of

the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Susaki teaches performing access control access right to a certain object by users, who are employing the access control list that includes access rights such as reading, writing and executing and retrieval means based on retrieval condition (fig. 4-5, 7 and 10, col. 1, lines 38-45, and lines 50-52; also, see col. 2, lines 1-25; col. 4, lines 1-10 and lines 50-67).

For the above reasons, Examiner believed that rejection of the last Office action was proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1, 7-10 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over US Patent No.: 6,178,422 B1 issued to Tada et al. (hereinafter Tada)

in view of US Patent No.: 5,819,295 issued to Nakagawa et al. (hereinafter Nakagawa).

      With respect to claim 1, Tada teaches an object management method for

performing access control for a stored object (document management to conduct an

access control operator in which a document to be outputted as a retrieval result under

a retrieval condition by a user or retriever or controlled in accordance with an authorized

level or retriever (col. 1, lines 5-12; and col. 7, lines 35-40, figs. 7 and 9), the method

comprising the steps of:

      defining a retrieval condition for retrieving an object (when a document is

registered or stored, retrieval data for document retrieval is created for each registered

document. So each user or group want to retrieve the stored object or stored/registered

document, he/she should have accessible or retrieval condition to that object comparing

with the access control table in which information indicating accessibility of groups of

users or users as the object/document retrievers for the document being registered and

the access right information setting to the users: col. 2, lines 1-38; also, col. 7, lines 5-18, and lines 35-52 and col. 8, lines 1-12);

setting an access right in association with the retrieval condition (allowing the user completely authenticated to access document management system containing registered documents for which access authentication has been already established, thereby conducting the access control operation; and to accomplish the access control operation for each document object through the user authentication, and access control operation in a plurality of levels corresponding to groups to which users belong. when users having different authorized access levels are allowed to access a document, the document is required to be registered to a plurality of databases, also, access right is depending to each user to each document object: the access right information to each user associated to the document and retrieval condition (col. 1, lines 45-67 and col. 2, lines 1-8 and col. 7, lines 7, lines 10-18 and col. 8, lines 18-35); and

setting an identifier for identifying the object, the identifier associated with the object in one-to-one relationship (a user belonging to the group is allowed to access the document; a document retrieval step of retrieving, in a retrieval operation of a document, the document by referring to retrieval data beforehand registered; an accessible document list creation step of extracting from the access table document lists including entries thereof associated with a user group to which a retriever of the document belongs, conducting a conjunction operation between the document

lists, thereby creating an accessible document list including a list of documents which

can be accessed by the retriever and when the access is to be allowed, in the access

control table, namely, there is recorded information that users belonging to the group

are allowed to access the pertinent document. In other words, when the access right

information is set to group 1 in association with a document with document number 7,

`1` is set to an entry of group 1 corresponding to document number 7; whereas, `0` is

kept unchanged in entries of other groups: col. 2, lines 50-67, col. 3, lines 1-15 and col.

7, lines 10-18, lines 35-50).

Tada teaches a document management system for controlling access right to a

registered document via an access control table containing information indicating

accessibility of groups including users as document retriever for the document being

registered and the access right information to each user associated to the document

and retrieval condition. And attribute information for all documents retrieved as a result

of the retrieval operation to determine whether or not the user belongs to a group of

users allowed to access the document. Tada does not explicitly teach the retrieval

condition being defined based on at least one attribute of the object and in response to

an access request from a user for the object matching the retrieval condition and the

identifier, performing access control on the basis of the access right.

However, Nakagawa teaches a document having attributes such as a date when

a document was made (col. 5, lines 1-45 and col. 8, col. lines 42-67); and performing

the access control based on the access right and displaying the result (col. 9, lines 18-

45 and col. 10, lines 10-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tada with the teachings of Nakagawa. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of determining a attribute of the object such as date creator as retrieval condition and performing matching retrieval condition and access right to the document as disclosed (Nakagawa's col. 5, lines 1-45 and col. 9, lines 18-45), into the system of Tada for the purpose of managing registered document and retrieving document, document storing and managing as the retrieval condition (Nakagawa's col. 1, lines 8-10 and col. 4, lines 30-50 and line 65-67).

With respect to claim 7, Tada teaches wherein the object is stored with attribute data, and the retrieval condition aims to retrieve the object on the basis of the attribute data (attribute information of all documents: sections 0012-0013).

With respect to claim 8, Tada teaches wherein the object is stored with attribute data and a method for referring to an entity of the object, and the retrieval condition aims to retrieve the object on the basis of the attribute data and the entity of the object referred to by the method (sections 0012-0013).

With respect to claim 9, Tada teaches wherein the access right is a specification about a user and an access type allowed to access the object (access right information such as reading, writing or executing to be set to the user; sections 0069 and 0086-0088).

Claim 10 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 16 is essentially the same as claim 7 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 7 hereinabove.

Claim 17 is essentially the same as claim 8 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 8 hereinabove.

Claim 18 is essentially the same as claim 9 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 9 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 19, Tada teaches an object management method for performing access control for a stored object (document management to conduct an access control operator in which a document to be outputted as a retrieval result under a retrieval condition by a user or retriever or controlled in accordance with an authorized level or retriever (col. 1, lines 5-12; and col. 7, lines 35-40, figs. 7 and 9), the method comprising the steps of:

defining a retrieval condition for retrieving an object (col. 2, lines 1-38; also, col. 7, lines 5-18, and lines 35-52 and col. 8, lines 1-12); and

setting an identifier for identifying the object, the identifier associated with the object in a one-to-one relationship (col. 2, lines 50-67, col. 3, lines 1-15 and col. 7, lines 10-18, lines 35-50).

Tada teaches a document management system for controlling access right to a registered document via an access control table containing information indicating accessibility of groups including users as document retriever for the document being registered and the access right information to each user associated to the document and retrieval condition. And attribute information for all documents retrieved as a result of the retrieval operation to determine whether or not the user belongs to a group of users allowed to access the document. Tada does not explicitly teach the retrieval condition being separate from the object and defined based on at least one attribute of the object and in response to an access request from a user for the object matching the retrieval condition and the identifier, performing access control to the object on the basis of the access right.

However, Nakagawa teaches a document having attributes such as a date when a document was made, that is, the attribute information to the object does not attach to the object and it is used for retrieving the object based on the retrieval condition entering from the user or retriever and access right to that user or retriever (col. 5, lines 1-45 and col. 8, col. lines 42-67); and performing the access control based on the access right and displaying the result (col. 9, lines 18-45 and col. 10, lines 10-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tada with the teachings of

Nakagawa. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize

the use of determining a attribute of the object such as date creator as retrieval

condition and performing matching retrieval condition and access right to the document

as disclosed (Nakagawa's col. 5, lines 1-45 and col. 9, lines 18-45), into the system of

Tada for the purpose of managing registered document and retrieving document,

document storing and managing as the retrieval condition (Nakagawa's col. 1, lines 8-

10 and col. 4, lines 30-50 and line 65-67).

7.   Claims 2-6 and 11-15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over US Patent No.: 6,178,422 B1 issued to Tada et al. (hereinafter Tada)

in view of US Patent No.: 5,819,295 issued to Nakagawa et al. (hereinafter Nakagawa)

and further in view of US Patent No.: 6,189,032 B1 issued to Susaki et al. (hereinafter

Susaki).

        With respect to claim 2, Tada in view of Nakagawa discloses a method for

performing access control for a stored object as discussed in claim 1.

        Tada and Nakagawa disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

        Tada and Nakagawa do not explicitly teach wherein performing a check, when a

request for access to an object occurs, to see whether the object meets the retrieval

condition, and controlling access to the access-requested object on the basis of the

access right that has been set in association with the retrieval condition as claimed.

However, Susaki teaches access right to a certain operation such as reading, writing, deleting, updating or executing and performing the access control via the access control list and identifier of object such as file or service stored in the table (see figs. 4, 5 and 6, col. 7, lines 36-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Tada in view of Nakagawa with the teachings of Susaki by incorporating the use of performing a check and controlling access in association with retrieval condition as disclosed (Susaki's col. 7, lines 36-65), into the system of Tada for the purpose of controlling access right to a certain service by a user of client terminal (Susaki's col. 1, lines 10-12).

With respect to claims 3-6, Tada in view of Nakagawa discloses a method for performing access control for a stored object as discussed in claim 1.

Tada and Nakagawa disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Tada and Nakagawa do not explicitly teach performing a check, when a request for access to an object occurs, to see whether the identifier of the object has been set in association with the retrieval condition, and controlling access to the access-requested object on the basis of the access right that has been set in association with the retrieval condition if a result of the check indicates that the identifier of the access-requested object has been set in association with the retrieval condition; wherein the association between the retrieval condition and the identifier is changed according to need when addition, modification, or deletion of the object identified by the identifier is made; performing access control, if the access-requested object matches a plurality of retrieval

conditions, on the basis of OR of the matched retrieval conditions; and performing

access control, if the access-requested object matches a plurality of retrieval conditions,

on the basis of AND of the matched retrieval conditions as claimed.

   However, Susaki teaches access right to a certain operation such as reading,

writing, deleting, updating or executing and performing the access control via the

access control list and identifier of object such as file or service stored in the table (see

figs. 4, 5 and 6, col. 7, lines 36-65);

   Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Tada in view of Nakagawa

with the teachings of Susaki by incorporating the use of performing a check and

controlling access in association with retrieval condition as disclosed (Susaki's col. 7,

lines 36-65), into the system of Tada for the purpose of controlling access right to a

certain service by a user of client terminal (Susaki's col. 1, lines 10-12).

   Claim 11 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it is directed to a system

rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 2

hereinabove.

   Claim 12 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a system

rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 3

hereinabove.

   Claim 13 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it is directed to a system

rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 4

hereinabove.

Claim 14 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 5 hereinabove.

Claim 15 is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 6 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 20, Tada in view of Nakagawa discloses a method for performing access control for a stored object as discussed in claim 19.

Tada and Nakagawa disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Tada and Nakagawa do not explicitly teach wherein performing a check, when a request for access to an object occurs, to see whether the object meets the retrieval condition, and controlling access to the access-requested object on the basis of the access right that has been set in association with the retrieval condition as claimed.

However, Susaki teaches access right to a certain operation such as reading, writing, deleting, updating or executing and performing the access control via the access control list and identifier of object such as file or service stored in the table (see figs. 4, 5 and 6, col. 7, lines 36-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Tada in view of Nakagawa with the teachings of Susaki by incorporating the use of performing a check and controlling access in association with retrieval condition as disclosed (Susaki's col. 7,

lines 36-65), into the system of Tada for the purpose of controlling access right to a

certain service by a user of client terminal (Susaki's col. 1, lines 10-12).

Conclusion

8.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANH LY whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV (Written Authorization being given by Applicant (MPEP 502.03 [R-2])) or fax to **(571) 273-4039** (unofficial fax number directly to examiner's office). The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **John Breene**, can be reached on **(571) 272-4107** or Primary Examiner, **Jean Fleurantin**, can be reached on **(571) 272-4035**.

    Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to: **Central Fax Center: (571) 273-8300.**

ANH LY /AL/

/JEAN B. FLEURANTIN/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162